

### REMARKS

In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicants elect Group I (claims 1-6) with traverse. Applicants respectfully submit the following remarks requesting rejoinder of the non-elected claims, because claims 1-6 and claim 7-9 do relate to a single general inventive concept, for at least the reasons that follow.

Kogen et al. does not disclose or suggest the compounds claimed. Claim 1 includes compounds of Formula A, which includes the compound of Formula 1, and which are pure chiral compounds. However, the compounds (i.e., I-53, I-63, I-65, I-66) disclosed in Kogen et al. (US 5,451,688) do not satisfy the compounds claimed, since the compounds in Kogen et al. do not teach any definite steric structure for the compounds disclosed. Thus, Kogen et al. does not disclose or suggest the claimed compounds.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that there is a remarkable difference, such as in the pharmaceutical field, between a compound without a definite steric structure and a pure chiral compound, where pure chiral compounds have been known to be much more effective than such compounds without a definite steric structure. By way of example, one chiral compound of synthetic DOPAMINE may be used as a drug to treat Parkinson disease, while another chiral compound of synthetic DOPAMINE is harmful to neurocyte, so it is predictable that using a compound without a definite steric structure may lead to disastrous result. Another example exists in Citalopram, of which (S)-Citalopram has a 30 times of effectiveness as that of (R)-Citalopram, and where Citalopram without definite steric structure, such as meso Citalopram, has a effectiveness far lower than the (S)-Citalopram.

Thus, as the compounds disclosed in US 5,451,688 have no definite steric structure, they do not satisfy the compounds presently claimed.

Moreover, the Formula (I)-(III) compounds are pure chiral compounds, which are included in the generic Formula (A) compound of claim 1 as variations of the "W". Applicants respectfully submit that such claimed compounds have similar steric properties, equivalent uses, and may be transformed to a same compound by simple hydrolysis. That is, the Formula (I)-(III) compounds relate to a single general inventive linked by claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the process claims 7-9,

which are respectively directed to methods for synthesizing the Formula (I)-(III) compounds, also relate to a single general inventive concept, and should be rejoined.

If claims 7-9 should remain withdrawn from consideration, then Applicants respectfully submit that the claims be reinstated should a generic claim be allowed.

With regard to the claim amendments, the revisions are supported in Applicants' original disclosure and do not contain new matter. Claim 7 has been editorially amended to correct typographical errors. Claim 10 has been amended to be directed to a method of method of manufacturing a medicament for inhibiting hydroxymethyl glutaryl coenzyme A reductase. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is drawn to statutory subject matter, and that claim 10 be examined with the elected claims. Claims 1-10 remain pending.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of the claims in the form of a Notice of Allowance. If any questions arise regarding this communication, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative listed below.



Dated: October 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Bryan A. Wang  
Reg. No. 50,836  
MDS/baw